



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,762	01/14/2004	Steven Maddocks	200315423-1	4235

22879 7590 05/02/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KEATON, SHERROD L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

05/02/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,762	MADDOCKS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sherrod Keaton	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing of 1-29-2008. Claims 1-20
are pending and have been considered below:

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 1-29-08, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY
REOPENED. Options are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the
following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply
under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed
by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and
appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth
in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant
must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by
signing below:

/William L. Bashore/
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 2100

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (6839747 B1) in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Claim 1: Blumenau discloses a storage network comprising:

an interface manager that interface manager aggregating configuration information in the automated storage system;

an interface application provided in computer readable storage at the interface manager, the interface application generating user interface rendering data for the configuration information

a graphical user interface operatively associated with the interface application, the graphical user interface outputting the configuration information in accordance with the user interface rendering data receiving user input to change access permissions for

hosts (abstract; Figure 14). A graphical user interface is shown that renders configuration information.

but does not explicitly disclose an automated storage system including data access drivers that perform read or write operations on a storage media and transfer robotics that transfer the storage media to the data access drives. However Applicants Admitted Prior Art discloses that these systems are commonly known (AAPA; Paragraph 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the addition of data access drivers and transfer robotics to Blumenau as taught by AAPA and also provide control access to these instruments. One would have been motivated to include access control to these instruments to expand operability and functionality of the system.

Claim 2: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further discloses an interface application receiving the configuration information from a management pipeline at the interface manager (Blumenau: Column 24, Lines 38-54).

Claim 3: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose the interface application including a state machine to determine a state of the data access drivers and transfer robotics based at least in part on the

Art Unit: 2175

configuration information (Blumenau: Column 29, Lines 57-67). Shows the state of which volume is accessible and so on.

Claim 4: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further discloses the interface application including a render engine to generate the user interface rendering information (Blumeanu: Figure 14; Column 17, Line 18-Column 18, Line 8; Column).

Claim 6: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose displaying access permissions for the data access drives and transfer robotics in table format (Blumenau: Figure 16; Column 30, Lines 49-63). The access drivers and transfer robotics are provided by AAPA.

Claim 7: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose user input to deny and grant access permissions for the host to the data access drivers and transfer robotics (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-Column 18, Line 8; Column 24, Line 38-46).

Claims 8 and 17: Blumenau discloses an automated storage system and method linked to a graphical user interface and method comprising:

Art Unit: 2175

aggregating configuration information at an interface manager for a plurality of system devices generating a user interface rendering data at the interface manager; and displaying the configuration information in an application window at the graphical user interface in accordance with the user interface rendering data and receiving user input in the application window to change access permissions of hosts (abstract; Figure 14).

A graphical user interface is shown that renders configuration information.

but does not explicitly disclose including data access drives that receive movable storage media from transfer robotics in an automated storage system. However Applicants Admitted Prior Art discloses that these systems are commonly known (AAPA; Paragraph 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the addition of data access drivers and transfer robotics in the storage system of Blumenau as taught by AAPA. One would have been motivated to include these instruments to expand operability and functionality of the system.

Claim 5 and 9: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a storage network as in Claims 1 and 8 above and does not explicitly disclose a graphical user interface displaying a logical map of the data access drivers and transfer robotics (Blumenau: Figure 14; Column 17, Line 61-Column 18, Line 8). Here Blumenau shows a topology (mapping) of the host connections and therefore shows the functionality of mapping devices of a system. AAPA provides the data access drivers and transfer robotics.

Claim 10: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system as in Claim 8 above and further disclose displaying the access permissions for the system devices in the application window (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60; Column 30, Lines 49-63).

Claim 11: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above and further discloses receiving the user input in the application window to grant and deny the hosts access to the data access drives and the transfer robotics (Blumenau: abstract; Figure 16; Column 17, Lines 44-60; Column 30, Lines 49-63). The access drivers and transfer robotics are provided by AAPA.

Claim 12: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above and further discloses receiving management commands for the system devices based on user input at the application window (Blumenau: abstract). User inputs allow management of the system with access permission.

Claim 18: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a method as in Claim 17 above and further disclose user selections from the graphical user interface to add and remove drives from the system devices (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60).

4. Claims 13-16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (6839747 B1) and Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) as applied to Claims 1, 8 and 17 above in further view of Dimitroff (US 6212606B1) and Yung et al (2004/0032430A1).

Claim 13: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose copying all access permissions for a first host selection to a second host selection in the application window. However Yung discloses a function of cut, copy and paste functions

Art Unit: 2175

the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing host and devices having shared capabilities (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of the cut, copy, paste to copy the access and security parameters of the first host to be copied to a second host in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to copy access permissions in order to allow the two host shared access and security improving functionality of the system.

Claim 14: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose removing all access permissions for at least one host selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow removing of access and security parameters of a host in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to remove access permissions in order to allow improved user operability to edit, reorder or allow open access to that host.

Claim 15: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose copying all access permissions for a first device selection to a second device selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of the cut, copy, paste to copy the access and security parameters of the first device to be copied to a second device in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to copy access permissions in order to allow the two host shared access and security improving functionality and efficiency of the system.

Claim 16: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose removing all access permissions for at least one device selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would

Art Unit: 2175

have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow removing of access and security parameters of a device in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to remove access permissions in order to allow improved user operability to edit, reorder or allow open access to that host.

Claim 19: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a user selection from the graphical user interface to edit access permissions to the system devices as in Claim 18 above but does not explicitly disclose copying and pasting access permissions for a first host selection to a second host selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions in the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first host to be copied to a second host in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to allow copy and pasting of access permissions to add efficiency to the process.

Claim 20: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a user selection from the graphical user interface to edit access permissions to the system devices as in Claim 18 above but does not explicitly disclose copying and pasting access permissions for a first system

Art Unit: 2175

device to a second system device. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions in the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first device to be copied to a second device in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to allow copy and pasting of access permissions to add efficiency to the process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-

Art Unit: 2175

1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

4-25-08

/William L. Bashore/
Primary Examiner
Tech Center 2100